

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

JOINT COST ESTIMATE TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

► **Meeting Date:** *Wednesday, September 25, 2013* ► **Time:** *2:30pm -3:30pm*

► **Meeting Place:** *Sheraton Denver West, 360 Union, Lakewood, CO Bergen Room*

► **Distribution / Attendees ('):**

► <i>John Braaksma</i> <i>Parsons</i>	► <i>Julia Barker</i> <i>Parsons</i>	► <i>John Crowder</i> <i>Parsons</i>
► <i>Jill Donnelly</i> <i>Parsons</i>	► <i>Brad Doyle</i> <i>Parsons</i>	► <i>Phil Hoffmann</i> <i>Parsons</i>
► <i>Ralph Trapani</i> <i>Parsons</i>	► <i>Mark</i> <i>Shannon & Wilson</i>	► <i>Rick Andrew</i> <i>Yeh & Assoc.</i>
► <i>Marianna Torres</i> <i>Louis Berger Group</i>	► <i>Lisa McDonald</i> <i>Louis Berger Group</i>	►
► <i>David Krutsinger</i> <i>CDOT</i>	► <i>Steve Yip</i> <i>CDOT</i>	►
►	►	►
►	►	►

	Technical Issue/Challenge	Solution	Client Benefits
1.	I-70 CSS requirements vs. governing agency (AASHTO, CDOT, etc.) design requirements	Brad to develop CSS footprint vs. designed footprint	At first glance, a designed footprint will be smaller than a CSS footprint, saving money and time.
2.	3 rd bore at EJMT	Use only a north bore for the Level 1 study.	Will be the more expensive option, which will provide a conservative comparison with T&R study.
4.	3 rd bore and widened bores at Twin Tunnels		
3.	Roadway drainage cost estimate	Develop a cost/mile	Will provide a quick way to estimate drainage cost for the Level 1 effort.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY

ISSUES TASK FORCES

Meeting Notes

New Business

Topic #1 – Information Provided

- The CSS guidelines (CSS) to not allow modifications to inside edge of pavement. The Parsons alternative alignments utilize the median. No design exceptions/design deviations to the CSS have been requested to date.
- Brad and Ralph confirmed with Rick Andrews that the CSS were not applied to the options in the PEIS.
- CSS requires 30' clear zones (that is, no guardrail or barrier) leading to a very wide typical section, which is not practical for the topographically constrained I-70 Mountain Corridor.
- Brad is assuming the structures/geotech group will need to cost 3 wall types: Tie-back/soil nail (for uphill cut walls); MSE walls (medial fill wall); MSE or founded walls (for downhill walls).
- The current design accounts for direct connect structures at the Evergreen Parkway exit (existing MP 252), CO 103 in Idaho Springs (existing MP 240); and US 40/Empire (existing MP 232).
- Structures group will need to account for large mammal crossings required by ALIVE. Environmental group to provide more information first week of October.
- Ralph/Joe/Brad to provide answers to questions raised by Phil Hoffmann in 9/26/13 e-mail.

Topic #2 – Action Item Review

- Developed Action Items for register (attached).

Topic #3 – Technical Concepts

- For the Level 1 task, consider the north bore at EJMT only. The south bore will impact Loveland Ski Area and there is an agreement in place with the owners that any future tunneling would not impact the ski area. The north bore is the more expensive option, and will provide a conservative ratio when compared with values from the T&R study.

Topic #4 – Coordination with other Task Forces

- Brad has an alignment available that Julia and John can use for preliminary structure delineation.
- October 23rd meeting will be held with the Roadway ITF
- The Environmental ITF will have more information about the animal crossing sizes subsequent to their October 1st meeting.

Action Item Register attached.

These notes are an interpretation of discussions held. Please provide any additions or corrections to the originator within seven days of the date signed, otherwise they will be assumed correct as written.

► Prepared By: J. Barker,

Date: September 26, 2013

Next Meeting: October 23rd, Parsons Office (1776 Lincoln Street, Suite 600, Denver, CO 80203)

Time TBD 9:00 AM to 1:30 PM for the Transit Task Force, Kenosha Room, 6th floor

ACTION ITEM REGISTER

Roadway (R), Structures (S), Transit (TR), Tunnels (TU)

[illegible]